

PR2



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/483,876	01/18/2000	Alain Jules Mayer	6-9-1	8971

7590 05/30/2003

RYAN MASON & LEWIS LLP  
1300 POST ROAD  
SUITE 205  
FAIRFIELD, CT 06430

EXAMINER

MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 05/30/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/483,876

Applicant(s)

MAYER ET AL.

Examiner

Adnan M Mirza

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 January 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 April 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reid et al (U.S. 6,182,226) and further in view of Flint et al (U.S. 6,453,419).

3. As per claims 1,9,12,19,27-29 Reid disclosed a method for analyzing at least one gateway in a network, said at least one; gateway having a packet filtering configuration file including a plurality of rules, said network having a plurality of addresses (col. 1, lines 59-67 & col. 2, lines 1-4), said method comprising the steps of generating a gateway-zone graph that models said network based on said packet filtering configuration file, said gateway-zone graph having at least one gateway node corresponding to said at least one gateway and at least two zone nodes (col. 7, lines 28-39), wherein said at least one gateway is a packet filtering machine and each of said zone nodes correspond to a partitioned collection of said addresses created by said at least one gateway (col. 5, lines 45-49); receiving a query inquiring whether one or more given services are permitted between at least one source address and at least one destination address (col. 5, lines 34-56);

However Reid failed to disclose evaluating said query against each of said rules associated with each gateway node in said gateway-zone graph that is encountered between said at least one source address and said at least one destination address.

Art Unit: 2141

In the same field of endeavor Flint disclosed the regions that the service bridge, and the access control decisions. The user draws a graph which starts with service and a to-from set. Next the user creates a path consisting of the desired options which can include: time, session counts, authentication, encryption, users/groups, WWW filters, ftp filters, email filters, destination address re-writes, to addresses and from addresses. The user is building a decision tree (col. 6, lines 3-11).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated evaluating said query against each of said rules associated with each gateway node in said gateway-zone graph that is encountered between said at least one source address and said at least one destination address as taught by Flint in the system of Reid to make the alarm notification more efficient and be more fault tolerant.

4. As per claims 2,13,20 Reid disclosed wherein said rules are expressed as rule-base objects (col. 5, lines 64-67 & col. 6, lines 1-3).

5. As per claims 3,10,14,21 Reid disclosed wherein said gateway-zone graph is derived from a network topology file (col. 7, lines 61-67).

6. As per claims 4,15,22 Reid disclosed wherein said query includes a wildcard for at least one of said service, source address or destination address (col. 6, lines 9-15).

7. As per claims 5,23 Reid disclosed further comprising the step of determining a portion of said one or more given services that are permitted between at least one source address and at least one destination address (col. 6, lines 9-15).

8. As per claims 6,11,16,24 Reid disclosed further comprising the step of transforming said packet filtering configuration files into a table of logical rules that are processed during said evaluating step (col. 7, lines 33-39).

Art Unit: 2141

9. As per claims 7,17,25 Reid disclosed wherein said query consists of a source host-group, a destination host-group, and a service host-group (col. 8, lines 20-25 & col. 7, lines 39-59).

10. As per claims 8,18,26 Reid disclosed wherein said query specifies a location where packets are to be inserted into the network that is different from a source address (col. 6, lines 1-19).

Applicant's arguments are as follows:

11. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose generating or analyzing a "gateway-zone graph that models said network based on said packet filtering configuration file".

As to applicant's arguments Reid disclosed a plurality of network interfaces which communicate with the operating system kernel; and a firewall comprising a plurality of regions, wherein a set of policies have been configured for each of the plurality of regions (col. 2, lines 6-11).

12. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose the invention generates the graphical model from the rules of one or more firewalls.

As to applicants arguments Reid disclosed the firewall's access flow diagrams allow any decision criteria to be based on any other decision, in any order. If the administrator wants to check user first, then time, then apply a specific access policy, they can. In addition, the flow diagrams are object oriented for greater power (col. 7, lines 28-33).

***Conclusion***

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (703)-305-4633.

15. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (703)-308-5221. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239.

Art Unit: 2141

16. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)-746-7239 (For Status Inquiries, Informal or Draft Communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT");

(703)-746-7239 (For Official Communications Intended for entry, please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"),

(703)-746-7238 (For After Final Communications).

17. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)-305-3900.

Any response to a final action should be mailed to:

BOX AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C.20231


Or faxed to:

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Receptionist, Crystal Park II,  
2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202.

AM

Adnan Mirza

Examiner



B. Jaroenphonwanit

Primary Examiner